IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.M.JOSEPH

FRIDAY, THE 2ND NOVEMBER 2007 / 11TH KARTHIKA 1929

WP(C).No. 32219 of 2007(I)

PETITIONER:

V.T.JOSE,S/O. THOMAS, AGED 50 YEARS
SENIOR CLERK, PARATHODE SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE
BANK LTD, NO,K.353,PARATHODE IDUKKI DISTRICT
NOW RESIDING AT VADAKKEMALACHIRA, THELLITHODE,
MANKOOVA P.O., IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.A.C.DEVASIA
SRI.T.J.MICHAEL

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. THE PARATHODE SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE
BANK LTD,REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
PARATHODE P.O., IDUKKI DISTRICT.

2. THE PRESIDENT, PARATHODE
SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. NO. 363,
PARATHODE, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 02/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.M.JOSEPH, J.

\- -

W.P.(c).No.32219 OF 2007

\- -

Dated this the 2nd day of November, 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioner challenges Exts.P13, P16 and P17 and seeks to quash the same. Petitioner seeks a direction not to revert the petitioner as Salesman on the basis of Ext.P13. According to the petitioner, on an allegation that there was delay in sending the demand draft, petitioner was proceeded against and punishment was imposed. According to the him, he has preferred statutory appeal. But in the meantime, a penalty is being implemented. I do not think that there is anything in this writ petition which warrants interference under Article 226. Admittedly, petitioner has preferred an appeal and the appeal is pending consideration before the Committee. If the appeal is decided in favour of the petitioner, petitioner will become entitled to the fruits of the decision. If it is adverse to the petitioner, it is for the petitioner to work out his remedy as available in law. Therefore, I do not see any reason warranting interference under Article 226.

The writ petition is disposed of without prejudice to the right of the petitioner to prosecute his remedies available to him in law.

(K.M.JOSEPH, JUDGE)

sv.